



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

so to say, in very sight of heaven, if the gift of perseverance does but complete the work. Now here observe, it is not certain that a soul which has the first grace will have the second: the grant of the second depends on its use of the first. Again, it may have the first and the second, and yet not the third, or from the first on to the twentieth, and not the twentieth. We mount up by steps toward God, and, alas! it is possible that a soul may be courageous and bear up for nineteen steps and faint at the twentieth. Nay, further than this, a soul may go forward till it arrives at the very grace of contrition—a contrition so loving and sin-repouncing as to bring it at once into a state of reconciliation, and clothe it in the vestment of purity, and yet it may yield to the further trials which beset it, and fall away.

“Now, all this may take place even outside the Church; and consider what at once follows from it. This follows in the first place, that men there may be—not Catholics—really obeying God and rewarded by Him, being in His favour, with their sins forgiven, and with a secret union with that heavenly kingdom to which they do not visibly belong, who are, through their subsequent failure, never to reach it. There may be those who are increasing in grace and knowledge, and approaching nearer to the Catholic Church every year, who are not in the Church, and never will be. The highest gifts and graces are compatible with ultimate reprobation. . . . We do not think it necessary to carp at every instance of supernatural excellence among Protestants when it comes before us, or to explain it away;—all we know is, that the grace given them is intended ultimately to bring them into the Church; and if it does not tend to do so, it will not ultimately profit them.”

In this passage, in which Dr. Newman expresses himself with his usual evasiveness, he frankly admits that supernatural grace is communicated outside His Church, but he does not state distinctly whether or not the grace of perseverance can be had outside his own communion. If it can, the doctrine of exclusive salvation is abandoned. We gather, therefore, that the writer believes that it cannot, and that according to the dictum, which, if we remember right, he quotes in another place, “*everything can be had outside the Church except salvation.*”

And yet this dictum appears to us paradoxical and monstrous. We are asked to believe that the multitudes of holy men and women who die every year in the communion of our Church; have “really obeyed God and been rewarded by Him; have been in His favour; have had their sins forgiven;” have spent their lives on this earth in His love and fear; and yet that they will be visited by Him with everlasting destruction. When we hear such doctrines as this we seem to hear the very voice of the false prophets of old, whom God rebuked: “With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad.”

We cannot forbear to go on to cite the line of argument which Dr. Newman next pursues. We must presume that his lectures are addressed altogether to those of the Tractate party, who had followed his teaching up to the point where he left the Church of England, and whom he now endeavours to persuade to come with him the rest of the way. The argument is then briefly this, that if the presence of grace in the Church of England were a proof of the possibility of salvation in that communion, they would in consistency be reduced to the absurdity of admitting the possibility of salvation of Methodists, Independents, and such like.

After dwelling at length on the striking proofs of grace exhibited by John Wesley and his followers, he goes on—
“Or to turn to other communions, whom have you with the capabilities of greatness in them which show themselves in the benevolent zeal of Howard the philanthropist or Elizabeth Fry? or consider the almost miraculous conversion and subsequent life of Colonel Gardener. Why, even old Bunyan, with his vivid dreams when a child, his conversion, his conflicts with Satan, his preachings and imprisonments, however inferior to you in discipline of mind and knowledge of the truth, is in the outline of his history more apostolical than you. Weep not for me, were his last words, as if he had been a saint, ‘but for yourselves. I go to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, doubtless, through the mediation of His Son, will receive me, though a sinner, when we shall ere long meet to sing the new song, and be happy for ever.’ Consider the thousands of death-beds of those in and out of the Establishment who, with scarcely one sentiment of religion in common with you, die in confidence of the truth of their doctrine and of their personal safety. Does the peace of their deaths testify to the divinity of their creed or of their communion? Does the extreme earnestness and reality of religious feeling exhibited in the sudden sickness and death of one who was as stern in his hatred of your opinions as in that earnestness of feeling [Dr. Arnold], who one evening protested against the sacramental principle and next morning died with the words of holy Scripture in his mouth—does it give any sanction to that hatred and that protest? And there is another, a Calvinist [Mr. Scott], one of whose special and continual prayers in his last illness was for perseverance in grace, who cried, ‘O Lord, abhor me not, though I be abhorrible and abhor myself!’ and who, five minutes before his death, by the expression of his countenance, changing from prayer to admiration, and calm peace, impressed upon the bystanders that the veil had been removed from his eyes, and that, like Stephen, he saw things in-

visible to sense: did he by the circumstances of his death-bed bear evidence to the truth of what you, as well as I, hold to be an odious heresy? Mr. Harvey resigned his neck soul into the hands of his Redeemer, saying, ‘Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace.’ Mr. Walker, before he expired, spoke nearly these words: ‘I have been on the wings of the cherubim. Heaven has in a manner been opened to me; I shall be there soon.’ ‘Mr. Whitfield rose at five o’clock on the Sabbath day; went to his closet, and was unusually long in private; laid himself on his bed for about ten minutes; then went on his knees and prayed most fervently he might that day finish his Master’s work. Then he sent for a clergyman, and before he could reach him closed his eyes on this world, without a sigh or groan, and commenced a sabbath of everlasting rest.’ Alas! there was another who for three months ‘lingered,’ as he said, ‘in the face of death.’ ‘Oh, my God,’ he cried ‘I know Thou dost not overlook any of Thy creatures. Thou dost not overlook me. So much torture . . . to kill a worm! Have mercy on me. I cry to Thee, knowing I cannot alter Thy ways—I cannot if I would, and I would not if I could. If a word could remove these sufferings I would not utter it. Just life enough to suffer,’ he continued; ‘but I submit, and not only submit, but rejoice.’ One morning he woke up, and with firm voice and great sobriety of manner spoke only these words: ‘Now I die!’ He sat as one in the attitude of expectation, and about two hours afterwards it was as he had said. And he was a professed infidel, and worse than an infidel—an apostate priest.”

We have allowed Dr. Newman to state his instances fully, which cause no difficulty to us, however perplexing they may have been to those to whom they were addressed. We allow that the confidence which a dying man may feel in the truth of his opinions and in his own future salvation is no proof either of the one or the other; yet when we see the grace of God present with him, enabling him to bear sickness and suffering with patience, giving him resignation to the will of God and unfeigned trust in His mercy through Christ, we may reasonably hope and believe that his errors, whatever they may have been, were not incompatible with his final salvation. None of the instances produced by Dr. Newman are likely to cause any difficulty to our readers, except, perhaps, the last. And even in that case, when we see some of the fruits of the faith which once he held abiding after the faith itself had passed away, may we not charitably hope that the aberrations of intellect over which his friends had to mourn in his later years did not sever him from the Saviour, who did not cease to be near him, though the eyes of his understanding had become unable to discern him.

In point of fact, though Roman Catholics hold this doctrine of exclusive salvation, they make no difficulty when they wish to be charitable in admitting the possible salvation of Protestants. It is a common practice with them to lay down a rule, and afterwards cut out the heart of it with exceptions nearly as wide as the rule. So it is here; and though “exclusive salvation” is the rule, “invincible ignorance” will afford as many exceptions as can be desired. Indeed, when Roman Catholic divines are in a tolerant frame of mind, it would seem as if they were willing to pronounce any man’s ignorance invincible provided it had not actually been conquered. In a later part of these same lectures it is only Mr. Newman’s old friends, the Tractates, whom he will not allow to plead this excuse. In every other variety either in the Establishment or Methodism, or in Dissent, there may be found real earnestness coupled with invincible prejudice. “Among the most bitter railers against the Church in this country may be found those who are influenced by divine grace, and are at present travelling toward heaven, whatever be their ultimate destiny.” “Protestants may be living in the midst of Catholic light, and labouring with the densest and most stupid prejudices, and yet we may be able to view them with hope, though with anxiety—with the hope that the question has never occurred to them—strange as it may seem—whether we are not right and they wrong.”

But if this excuse of invincible ignorance be thus freely allowed, the whole doctrine of exclusive salvation crumbles away. Mr. Newman has already allowed that those out of the Church may go on from step to step receiving and increasing supernatural grace. And now, with this excuse of invincible ignorance, there is nothing to prevent them from receiving the grace of perseverance and of salvation also. What, then, is left to terrify us in the doctrine of exclusive salvation? After a very diligent examination of the subject, we have obtained a very firm conviction that the pretensions of the Church of Rome are untenable, and we think we can maintain that our ignorance of any solid foundation for her claims is quite invincible. What hinders us, then, from abiding where we are, and obtaining salvation as well as in the Church of Rome.

Nay, not as well as in our Church, cries the Romanist; you may, I admit, obtain salvation, but not as well as with us, nor are you as likely to do so. But if this be all, we may say exactly the same to them. We do not deny that salvation may be had in their Church by those who have held fast to the rock, even though they have built wood, hay, or stubble upon the one foundation; but we deny that it is as safe to be in their Church as in ours. In fact, almost all our points of difference relate to things which they do, and we believe to be wrong to do.

Is not the safer course clearly to let them alone. Thus, they believe the use of images in worship to be innocent, while we condemn them as leading to idolatry. Is it not the safer course (lest, perhaps, we may be right) to make no use of images? They believe it right to employ the mediation of the Virgin and of saints, while we think it wrong to employ any mediator save Christ alone. As he is confessedly sufficient, is it not safer to employ only Him? They bow down in adoration before what we believe to be bread, and what they—since they cannot see the priest’s intention—have no certainty of being anything else. Is it not safer, lest haply they may be guilty of idolatry, to employ no such adoration? We might go through the other Roman Catholic doctrines in like manner, but we think no doubt can remain that whichever may be the truest, ours is the safer way.

In conclusion, we beg our Roman Catholic friends to ask themselves, have they any real grounds for thinking that submission to the Bishop of Rome is an essential condition of our everlasting salvation? If it is, how does it happen that our Lord and His Apostles never men-tioned it? and how does it happen that the Church for many ages did not receive this dogma, nor include it in any of those summaries of essential truths known by the name of creeds? Let them consider what a stumbling-block they lay in the way of Protestants, who might be otherwise ready to join their Church, if they can only gain admission on condition of consigning to perdition all their dear relatives and friends who have not made up their minds to join them in the same step. And yet, if this doctrine of exclusive salvation be too revolting to be believed, what certainty can there be of the truth of any other doctrine put forward by the same Church.

ST. JEROME.

In estimating the value of the evidence of any ecclesiastical or other writer, it is of some importance that we should hold in mind the personal character and history of the individual, as well as the exact age in which he lived.

Previously, therefore, to considering the writings of St. Jerome, as we undertook to do in our last number, when remarking on the letter of our respected correspondent, Dr. Geraghty, we propose to give a brief account of St. Jerome himself.

Jerome is said to have been born about A.D. 345, at Strigonom or Stridona, on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia, which is so near to Italy, as observed by Erasmus, that the Italians claim him as a compatriot. His father, Eusebius, was a man of rank and opulence, and sent him to Rome, where he was educated under the most learned masters—the celebrated Donatus, the commentator upon Terence and Virgil, and Victorinus, an eminent professor of rhetoric, and Christian philosopher of the Platonic school. He soon made wonderful proficiency in the different branches of philosophy and an acquaintance with the profane authors, and began his acquaintance with the Hebrew language, which he afterwards improved with great application and diligence. Jerome continued his studies at Rome till he was of adult age, and after having been baptized at Rome, which circumstance he repeatedly afterwards referred to in his writings, he travelled in Gaul, where there were at the time many able and learned men, diligently examined all the libraries wherever he came, and subsequently returned to Rome, where he at first purposed to spend his life in studious retirement, and collected a very valuable library. Finding, however, that neither the incessant business and noise of a great city like Rome, nor his native country, which he represents as entirely sunk in sensuality and luxury, were favourable to a life of learned study and retirement, he left his country, kinsmen, and estate, and departed from Italy with some companions, and after successively sojourning at Jerusalem and Antioch, he ultimately retired with his books to the dismal deserts of Syria, then almost uninhabited except by a few monks. An excessive admiration of monastic excellence, and ardour for the habits which conferred it, seem to have constituted the ruling principles of his life, and may account, perhaps, in conjunction with the wild and savage character of his abode, for somewhat of that fierceness and violence with which he attacked even his Christian adversaries, against whom he too frequently poured forth a torrent of angry and sometimes even rancorous eloquence, disparaging those practical and substantial virtues which he could rarely witness and could never practise, and in their stead exaggerating the merit of mortification, and fasting, and celibacy, which were the natural and almost necessary accompaniments of his life of study and seclusion. In this way he spent four years in intense labour, and with such unremitting severity of ascetic discipline that his health became greatly impaired, and he was obliged to quit his solitude and to return to Antioch, in order to recruit his strength.

The Eastern Churches were at that time sadly torn asunder by the Arian heresy. Under the patronage of the Emperor Valens, indeed, Arianism had for a time achieved an almost general ascendancy. Even the orthodox Churches, such as Antioch, where a numerous Athanasian party still held up their head, were divided by contending factions. No less than three rival Bishops, Meletius, Paulinus, and Vitalis, each of whom had his party of adherents, assumed the title of Bishop of that city. The schism turned as much upon certain subtle questions as to

the true acceptance of the terms of the Nicene confession as upon the merits of their respective elections to the episcopal office. The disputes appear to have run upon the signification of the terms "substance," or "being," and "hypostasis," or "person," and Jerome, then a young man, became perplexed by the dialectic subtleties put forth by the several parties which thus divided the Oriental Churches, and being then a layman, though probably then contemplating ordination (as he was admitted into the order of presbyter by Paulinus a year or two afterwards), he naturally looked to his spiritual father at Rome, the octogenarian Damasus, for advice and guidance as to which party he should admit as the true bishop of the then place of his abode. As the ecclesiastical historian Dupin observes (vol. i., p. 341), "his baptism having made him a son of the Church of Rome, he was obliged to own him whom that Church acknowledged for lawful Bishop of Antioch." For this purpose he wrote to Damasus, then bishop of Rome, the letter on which our correspondent so strongly relies.

With these few preliminary remarks on the personal character and history of St. Jerome, we now proceed to inquire what is the real weight of Jerome's testimony on the subject of Papal supremacy; comparing what he then wrote with other parts of his undoubted writings, and holding in mind that all his habits and principles naturally and almost necessarily represented (not those of the Eastern Churches, but) those of Rome itself, in which he had been baptized and educated.

The substance of this letter to Damasus, written about A.D. 374, is as follows:—

"Jerome to Damasus.—Since the east, dashed together by the old madness of the people, tears piecemeal the seamless tunic and coat of the Lord, and the foxes destroy the vine of Christ, as among reservoirs worn out, which hold no water; and it is difficult to understand where the fountain sealed, the garden enclosed, may be found; therefore I have thought it best for me to consult the chair of Peter and the faith praised by the apostle's mouth; asking at this time food for my soul from the same quarter where formerly I received the garments of Christ. For the vast extent of water and of land which lies between us, cannot keep me from seeking the pearl of price. 'Wherever the body is, there are the eagles gathered together.' The prodigal son having wasted his patrimony, the heritage of the fathers is kept safely amongst you alone. There the ground of the Lord, with its prolific soil, declares its purity by the return of an hundred fold: here, the grain, drowned in the furrows, degenerates into tares and straw. Now the Sun of Righteousness rises in the west; but in the east, that Lucifer who had fallen has placed his throne above the stars. You are the light of the world, you are the salt of the earth, you are vessels of gold and silver; here the vessels of earth and wood are shut up for the rod of iron and eternal fire. Notwithstanding, therefore, your greatness deters, yet your kindness invites me. With earnestness, I ask a victim of salvation from the priest—the defence which the sheep requires from the shepherd. Let envy depart, let the ambition of the Roman dignity be banished: I speak with the successor of the fisherman, and a disciple of the cross. I, who follow no primate except Christ, am united in communion to your blessedness; that is, to the chair of Peter: on that rock I know that the Church is built. Whoever eats the lamb out of that house is profane. If any one was not in the ark of Noah, he must perish in the flood. And because for my sins I have dwelt in this wilderness which lies on the boundary between Barbary and Syria, and could not always seek the holy (counsel?) of the Lord from your holiness, through so great an intervening distance; therefore I follow hither your colleagues, the confessors of Egypt; and among the largest vessels, I lie hid in a little boat. I know nothing of Vitalis, of Meletius, or Paulinus. Whoever does not gather with thee, scatters: that is, whoever is not of Christ is of Antichrist. For now—oh shame! after the Nicene faith, after the Alexandrine decree, the west also concurring—the new phrase of three hypostases is exacted of me, a Roman, by the Campenses, and the chief of the Arians. What apostles, I pray, have disclosed these words? What new Paul, the master of the nations, has taught this doctrine? We may ask what these three hypostases are supposed to mean? They say, three subsisting persons. We answer that we believe this. The sense does not content them; they insist upon the very words: because there lies hid I know not what poison in the syllables. We exclaim, if any one does not confess three hypostases—that is, three subsisting persons—let him be anathema. And because we do not pronounce their very words, we are adjudged heretics. But if any one, understanding the word hypostases in the sense of substance or essence, saith that the hypostasis is not one, in three persons, he is an alien from Christ; and in this confession we are united with you, as though we were branded together."

Now, if this were the only passage in the whole of St. Jerome's writings bearing on the question in hand, what does it amount to?

Supposing, as we must do, that he recognized Damasus as an undoubtedly true and orthodox bishop, and that of the chief city in the world, whose Church had been founded by the Apostle Peter, and which was his own mother Church beyond dispute, as he had been educated and baptized in it, what could be more natural and reasonable than that, being himself a mere layman in a strange and distant country, when perplexed as to which of these rival

bishops was the true Bishop of Antioch, and when new and doubtful phrases were pressed upon him by those whose orthodoxy he doubted, he should turn to Rome (considering himself to be, as he states, a Roman) for advice and direction? To be in communion with Damasus was, of course, in his eyes, and really, in fact, at that time, to be in communion with the whole orthodox Church—the chair of Peter, or, in other words, with the Church of Christ, of which Peter was the representative. He was evidently alluding throughout the whole epistle to a communion in the orthodox faith, as opposed to the heresy of Arius, and addressing himself to the Roman bishop, he compares the state of the two Churches, and tells Damasus that now the western Church, not the eastern, was the salt of the earth, the light of the world. I am not in communion with those heretical Arians, saith he; our faith is not the same. But I am in communion with thee, for thou holdest the faith of Peter and his chair. On that faith, that rock, I know the Church is built, out of which Church whoever eateth the paschal lamb is profane. Whoever does not gather with thee, by a communion in this true faith, scatters, since without this faith he cannot be of Christ, and therefore must needs be of Antichrist. "Jerome here alludes," says the learned Roman Catholic commentator, Erasmus, "to the house in which Christ, with the twelve apostles, ate the paschal lamb. And he referred to what we read in the 12th chapter of Exodus respecting the eating of the passover. 'It shall be eaten in one house, nor shall ye carry any portion of its flesh out of doors.' And again, Erasmus observes in his scholium on the passage and words, 'Super illam petram.' 'Not upon Rome was the Church built, as I think; for it might happen that Rome also should degenerate, but upon that faith which Peter professed, and which hitherto the Roman Church has preserved, by which alone she has been less troubled with heresies.' 'Nothing,' as Mr. Robins justly observes, 'can be gained from this passage of St. Jerome, unless by an obvious perversion, in applying that to a particular communion which Jerome speaks of the Church at large. The meaning is plain enough. In the words of Bishop Bilson, 'Out of this house (meaning thereby not the particular Church of Rome, but the Catholic Church of Christ), whosoever eateth the passover is, indeed, as Jerome saith, a profane person. This is far wide of the mark you shoot at;' or, as it is expressed by Field, 'By the name of the Church, immediately going before, is meant the universal Church; therefore, by this house we must understand that great house within the walls whereof the whole household of faith is contained.'"

If maturely considered, we do not hesitate to say, that this much vaunted letter falls very short, indeed, of establishing that Jerome himself considered that Rome had any spiritual authority over other Churches, though he, no doubt, looked on the Church of Rome as the type of orthodoxy and the guide which he was especially bound to follow. Much less does it afford evidence of what the Churches of Asia or Africa then believed on the matter. It would not be hard to prove, indeed, that Jerome held opinions by no means those of the whole Church of his time, though it is probable that his opinions, especially on questions of ecclesiastical polity or government, would lean towards those prevalent at Rome, which had, as we have learned before, a strong tendency, from an early period, to "lord it over God's heritage" by converting concessions of precedence into admissions of authority and jurisdiction, and, consequently, the evidence of Jerome, as a strong adherent of Rome, is of much less value on such a question than it would have been had he been a native of Antioch, the place from which he wrote, and had had no more personal connection with the Church of Rome than Meletius or Paulinus had.

We may just observe here, that St. Jerome, in another letter to Pope Damasus (No. 58, see Dupin, p. 348), expressly asks his advice with whom he ought to communicate, Meletius, Paulinus, or Vitalis; and it is singular enough, that though Damasus pronounced in favour of Paulinus, and, by necessary consequence, that both Meletius and Vitalis were schismatics, if not absolutely heretics, Meletius after all turned out to be the true bishop, and was recognised by the successors of Pope Damasus, if not also by himself, as not only the true and great Bishop of Antioch, but as a Saint.* In the mean-

* "Super illam petram." Non super Bonam, ut subintror. Nam fieri potest, ut Roma quique degeneret; sed super eam fidem, quam Petrus professus est, et quam hactenus Romana servavit Ecclesia, qua non alia minus laboravit heresibus. —Hieron. Op. tom. II., p. 91. Epist. Hieron. ad Damasum scholia.

* Bilson on Christian Subjection, p. 1, p. 88.

* Of the Church, book v., c. 36, p. 547.

* Among other things he held that the world would come to an end in the year of our Lord 1000, which was by no means the opinion of the universal Church in his time. —See Dupin's Ec. Hist., vol. i., p. 358.

* The decrees of the Roman Council he'd under Damasus himself, A.D. 369, are signed by Meletius as acknowledged Bishop of Antioch, see Labbe and Coss. Con. Gen., tom. 2, p. 894, and he seems actually to have presided at the great second General Council, that of Constantinople, held A.D. 381, which was attended by 150 bishops, among whom were St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory Nyssen, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, see Labbe and Coss., tom. II., p. 955. Bilson leaves it in doubt whether it was Meletius of Antioch or Gregory Nazianzen that presided at this Council, (freely admitting that Damasus did not either in person or by his Legates. —Labbe and Coss. tom. II., p. 968). But Gregory Nazianzen in his Carmen de Vita sua tells us that Meletius presided. —See Greg. Naz. opera, tom. II., p. 24. Morcell's ed. Paris 1630. See also Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists, vol. v., p. 597-8, a, 82; and that Meletius is worshipped as a saint may be seen by consulting the same Acta Sanctorum, Feb. xii. tom. 5, p. 365, &c.

time, however, Jerome had acted on the advice of Damasus, and received priest's orders from Paulinus! (See Dupin's Ec. Hist., vol. i., p. 341.)

This epistle to Damasus, however, though often relied on by Roman Catholic writers as conclusive on the subject of St. Jerome's opinions as to the supremacy of Rome, is not by any means either the sole or the most distinct part of his writings upon the matter, and we must, therefore, call our readers' attention to some others of his writings, referring even more directly to the subject; as we hold it to be a sound rule, that as far as possible we ought so to construe every author that he shall not be made to appear to contradict himself.

We shall first refer to St. Jerome's Epistle to Evagrius; in which we shall have a better means of judging of his sentiments, because the very point of this epistle was one of ecclesiastical polity, whereas the burden of his letter to Damasus related, as we have seen, to a subtle question of faith alone, or the orthodoxy of certain rival bishops at Antioch. In this epistle (to Evagrius), St. Jerome reproves the arrogance and presumption of the Deacons of the Church of Rome, who, being limited in number, had become so assuming as to prefer themselves before the Presbyters. In so reproving these deacons, Jerome takes occasion to enlarge on the offices of bishop, priest, and deacon, and their respective powers, and especially declares his opinion as to the comparative or relative authority of the Church of Rome. The very topic naturally led to the point under discussion, so that the sentiments of St. Jerome, when the epistle in question is well weighed, can hardly be mistaken.

And what does he say?

The passages important to the argument are as follow:—"The Church of Rome is not to be thought one thing, and that of the whole world another; Gaul and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and Judea, and all the barbarian nations, adore also one Christ, and observe the same rule of truth. IF AUTHORITY IS SOUGHT FOR, THE WORLD IS GREATER THAN ONE CITY. Wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tunis, HE IS OF THE SAME EXCELLENCY, OF THE SAME EPISCOPATE. The power of wealth and the lowliness of poverty does not make a bishop either less or greater, for they are all the successors of the Apostles. But you say, how is it that at Rome a presbyter is ordained upon the testimony of a deacon? Why do you urge to me the custom of a single city?" And the conclusion of this epistle is in these words:—"And that we may know the apostolic tradition to have been drawn from the Old Testament, what Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the temple; the same let the bishops, the presbyters, and the deacons claim to themselves in the Church."

We might cite further passages to show that St. Jerome had no idea of any authority superior to that of bishop, and even some which countenance the idea that the superiority of bishops themselves over presbyters was rather to be referred to the custom of the Church than to any divine institution; but as we do not undertake to defend St. Jerome's opinions, but are merely trying to discover what they were, we think we have sufficiently shown that he is no witness that the universal Church in his day recognized any superior, much less a supreme authority in the Church of Rome over all other Churches.

THE CHURCH OF THE FATHERS OF THE FATHERS.

We have often had occasion to inquire into the state and condition of the Church "in the days of the Fathers." We will endeavour now to go a step still farther back, and show the state of the Church in the days of THEIR Fathers—the Apostles of Christ our Head.

Before the world was made, God purposed to create for Himself a Church on earth, for the manifestation of His wisdom, even to angelic powers (Eph. iii. 9, 10, 11).

That Church was purchased by the Lord "with His own blood" (Acts xx. 28), and Christ shall "present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing" (Eph. v. 27).

What God has purposed—what Christ has purchased—that is ever accomplished by the Holy Ghost.

The Church was established on earth upon the day of Pentecost, the fiftieth day after Christ was risen from the dead, and ten days after Christ ascended into heaven.

Before that day, we read of "the disciples" (Acts i. 15); on that day, we read of THE CHURCH (Acts ii. 47).

On that day of Pentecost, was poured out the Holy Ghost (Acts ii. 1-4), by which THE CHURCH was first united into one body (1 Cor. xii. 13), and by which God still works out His own will, and the work of Christ in the Church (v. 6), until the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Of that Church Christ was the head. God "gave

"Nec altera Romana urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis existit, et est. Et Gallias, et Britannias, et Africa, et Persis, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbaras nationes unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas queritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubicumque fuerit Episcopus, sive Roma, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegi, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis; ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorum vel inferiorum Epi copum non facit. Ceterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt. Sed dicte, quomodo Romae ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur? Quid mihi propter unius urbis consuetudinem!" —Hier. Op. tom. II., p. 221.